

REMARKS

Reconsideration and further examination of this application is respectfully requested. The Office Action mailed on February 27, 2004 and the Yip reference cited therein have been carefully reviewed and considered. Claims 1-23 were last presented for examination. Claims 1, 8, 10 and 17 have been amended and claims 24 and 25 are new. Claims 1-25 are now presented for further examination.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102e

Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Yip et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0055172), hereinafter "Yip".

Amended claim 1 features "[A] method of generating a defect error log for a disc drive comprising: (a) identifying defective sector addresses of defective sectors on a disc; (b) converting the sector addresses of adjacent defective sectors into a single defect error entry, wherein the entry does not include a calculated defect angle; and (c) storing the defect error entry in the defect error log".

Applicant's claimed invention clearly distinguishes from the art of record because nowhere does Yip identically disclose the features of generating a defect log and converting the sector addresses of adjacent defective sectors into a defect error entry independent of a calculated defect angle as shown in claim 1. Rather Yip, teaches grouping defects in clusters which is "characterized by a set of new parameters, including a starting sector, a scratch parameter, a span parameter, and an angle parameter. The new parameters are stored in a second table, replacing the corresponding entries in the first table", (para 8). Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated and is allowable.

Because Yip fails to disclose the discussed limitations in amended claim 1, it is clear that Yip does not anticipate claims 2-7 and new claims 24-25 which depend from claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicant's new claim 25 features "...converting step further comprises at least three defective sectors that are adjacent to each other and form a non-linear curvature pattern". Nowhere does Yip identically disclose this feature and since

Yip does not identically disclose this feature, new claim 25 is not anticipated by Yip and is allowable.

Amended independent claims 8 and 10 include similar limitations as claim 1 and distinguish over Yip for the same reasons as set forth above. Additionally, amended claim 8 features “generating sector addresses from a defect error entry stored in a single defect error log... (a) obtaining a defect error entry in the defect error log; and (b) determining all sector addresses encoded in the defect error entry based on the information contained in the defect error entry...”. Further, amended claim 10 similarly features “[A] system for generating a single defect error log... that converts at least two sector addresses of adjacent defective sectors into a defect error entry... and stores the defect error entry in the defect error log.”

Applicant’s claimed invention clearly distinguishes from Yip because nowhere does Yip identically disclose the feature of generating a single defect log and managing the size of the defect log by merging defect log entries which can correspond to a series of adjacent defects. This is exemplified by Yip in paragraph 8 “[A]t the end of certification process, defects captured are stored in a certification log which is referred to as a first defect table in this discussion. A conversion process is carried out to convert the certification log to a compressed defect table. The compressed defect table is referred to as a second defect table”.

Dependent claim 9 depends from independent claim 8, claims 11-16 depend from independent claim 10, and therefore depend upon limitations that are not anticipated by Yip and are allowable.

Independent claim 17 depends from similar limitations as claim 1 and distinguishes over Yip for the same reasons as set forth above and is allowable. Dependent claims 18-23 depend from independent claim 17 and therefore depend upon limitations that are not anticipated by Yip and are allowable.

Accordingly, the above identified application, as amended, is now considered to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
SEAGATE TECHNOLOGY LLC
(Assignee of Entire Interest)

5/27/04

David K. Luente
David K. Luente Reg. No. 36,202
Seagate Technology LLC
Intellectual Property Dept. – COL2LGL
389 Disc Drive
Longmont, Colorado 80503
(720) 684-2295 (telephone)
(720) 684-2588 (facsimile)